

January 9, 2010

Mr. Ted Linnert  
Office of Communication & Public Involvement  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8 – OC  
1595 Wynkoop Street  
Denver, Colorado 80202-1129

Phillip Erquiaga  
82 Cedar Street Extension  
Libby, Montana 59923

Mr. Linnert,

This letter, and accompanying attachments, represents my “personal” response to the proposed plans for remediation of Operable Units 1 and 2 (OU-1 “former export plant” aka “Riverfront Park” and OU-2 “former screening plant.”) of the Libby Superfund Site. *When distributed - This response should include all attachments.*

Dr. Spears and LATAG have addressed many of the points I have concerns with (see attached *LATAG Response* documents, or review them at [www.LATAG.org](http://www.LATAG.org)). These include the EPA’s failure to establish analytical methods to properly quantify LA, failure to engage in adequate site-specific studies, failure to consider health effects of fibers above 10um and particularly below 5um in length, as well the failure to address long term effects of structures other than fibers. LATAG also addresses the failure of the EPA to address the long-term cumulative health risks, especially to children. And covers other important concerns.

My greatest concerns, as an engineer, are the manner in which EPA has approached the so-called “Cleanup” which is in reality a poor or even failed attempt to contain contamination.

There has been no attempt to “Systematically Clean” properties associated with the Libby Superfund Site. It is my position that we can never consider Libby safe until a thorough and “Systematic Cleanup” and an accepted outside peer reviewed health risk assessment is completed.

The first question seems to be “What is Clean up?” Well, I would think that if the EPA is to protect human health, and if LA has ANY possibility of having a 1 to 5 magnitude greater health risk than Chrysotile, as some scientists suggest, the EPA’s position should be that, until science proves otherwise, that ALL contamination should be removed to the extent that technology and science allows. REGARDLESS of COST!

Furthermore, there seems to be a greater increase of various problems in homes cleaned by EPA than in homes that have not been cleaned. This includes mold, which appears to

be a growing problem in homes that have been cleaned by EPA. It would seem that the containment procedures used to close exposure paths are also negatively altering the ability for these, so called "CLEANED" homes, to breath.

The second question is what is "systematic?" It is my position based on observations and experience that the manner in which the purported clean up is occurring is resulting in expanded contamination and cross-contamination. It appears there has been no logistical engineering done to assure that the method of clean up assures that recontamination of areas previously cleaned does not occur or that non-contaminated sites do not become contaminated. To the contrary, the manner in which this purported cleanup is performed WILL, without question, cause cross-contamination. Cross-contamination would occur even if all safety procedures and applicable regulations were followed. Which they are not!

In Libby money is consistently being pumped in to the needs of those suffering from asbestos related diseases (ARD), however the fact of the matter is that health care will continue to be the primary need and cost until the EPA changes their position from "Containment" and begins to engage in a "Systematic Cleanup" accompanied by outside peer review acceptance.

From the \$250,000,000 settlement from W.R. Grace \$11,000,000 (EPA stated this is now \$16,000,000 with current accrued interest.) has been set-aside for O & M (Operations and Maintenance). This money is set aside for cleaning properties after the ROD (Record of Decision). EPA states there will be ample funds available after the ROD's to handle those situations. However, I suggest that this is not true! If ROD's occur using the current "Containment" procedures and current flawed science and engineering, as opposed to a "Systematic Clean Up" using accepted outside peer reviewed science, we will suffer from excruciatingly enormous costs associated with O & M. Based on what EPA is spending today to partially clean each homes (contain i.e.: close exposure paths.) I calculate easily \$400,000,000 O&M costs for OU-4 alone. Of course it is virtually impossible to truly project this cost, but I state this as a low end and we know EPA will deny this projected cost. So the question is: Who will pay for this after the O & M funds are gone? This will be a burden on each of us individually and as taxpayers. The individual, the city, county, nor state will have the assets to pay for these costs. We again will have no choice but to be exposed to this deadly and debilitating contaminant.

Also associated with a ROD are "Institutional Controls." Institutional controls could alter our freedoms and lifestyles dramatically. I believe the people of Libby will resist excessive institutional; controls. For example: Who wants to be told how and when they can mow their lawns? Who wants a fine for mowing their lawn in a way that is not compliant with institutional controls? For the city and/or county to pay for the cost of institutional controls they will be forced to fine us or ignore institutional controls. The only way to avoid this is to have a "Systematic Cleanup" and outside peer reviewed accepted science that confirms we have an environment that is safe now and for future generations, thereby reducing the need for excessive institutional controls.

Although EPA states that ROD's, based on "Qualitative Risk Assessments" on OU-1 and OU-2 will not set a precedence for other Operational Units such as OU-4 (Libby), I suggest that, in the end they will set precedence, and EPA WILL attempt to move forward without "Quantitative Risk Assessments."

I cannot support the proposed plans for remediation based on a "Qualitative Risk Assessment". My acceptance of any remediation plan will only occur once an outside peer reviewed and outside peer accepted "Quantitative Risk Assessment" is achieved and once I know that all properties are being "Systematically Cleaned" in a manner that conforms to accepted engineering practice.

The ONLY alternative: Develop CURES for ALL ARD's in lieu of cleanup!

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Phillip Erquiaga".

Phillip Erquiaga

Cc: Governor Brian D. Schweitzer  
Senator Max Baucus  
Senator Jon Testor  
Congressman Dennis Rehberg

Encl: Summary  
Review of the Proposed Plan to address environmental cleanup at Operable  
Units 1 and 2 (OU-1 and OU-2)

## Summary

From the above discussion, it is clear that we still do not have enough information to estimate cancer and non-cancer risks from community exposures to LA associated with OU1 and OU2. Because of the complex multiple pathways of exposure to LA in the Libby area, and the lack of representative activity based sampling exposure data from the OU1 and OU2, uncertainties in exposure and risk of adverse health effects associated with OU1 and OU2 could result in an underestimate of cumulative cancer and non-cancer risks from exposure to LA in Libby.

The potential future health risks to Libby residents from exposure to LA is unknown because of uncertainties associated with: (a) the methods used to analyze asbestos; (b) the estimation of potential exposure to airborne asbestos from contaminated soils; (c) the lack toxicological information specific to LA; (d) the relative toxicity of short asbestos fibers (i.e., fibers  $<5\text{ }\mu\text{m}$  in length) in non-cancer health effects and (e) the lack of epidemiologic data evaluating the risk of adverse health outcomes associated with low-level, intermittent exposures to LA.

Before any Records of Decision are implemented in Libby, the uncertainties outlined above must be addressed:

- (a) Improved analytical methods must be used to quantify levels of LA in both soil and air at OU1 and OU2 and throughout Libby.
- (b) Conduct site-specific, activity-based field tests, during all seasons of the year, to assist in developing empirical relationships for exposure scenarios involving re-suspension of asbestos fibers from solid media (e.g., soil, dust) into air. Without knowledge of such relationships, the assurance of the elimination of exposure pathways and the protection of public health is uncertain. These limitations impede site-specific exposure assessment and risk characterization.
- (c) Execute a comprehensive LA toxicity assessment to determine the effectiveness of the Libby clean-up actions and whether more actions are required. The toxicity assessment should include the effects of low dose exposure on susceptible populations, including children. Toxicology studies are also needed to adequately define the toxicity associated with short ( $<5\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ ) LA fibers since these fibers are predominant in Libby, including ambient air.
- (d) Determine the reference concentration (RfC) for inhalation exposure to LA, including the risk contribution of LA fibers less than 5 micrometers ( $\mu\text{m}$ ) in length and  $0.25\text{ }\mu\text{m}$  in diameter.
- (e) Sponsor epidemiologic studies employing the use of activity-based sampling results from Libby to allow the reconstruction of lower-bound estimates of exposure to LA associated with clinically detectable disease.

In policies issued by EPA in their Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund, EPA is required to understand the cumulative risk from all exposures in the Libby area, and not just one OU. Recent case-control studies provide evidence for increased

mesothelioma and lung cancer risks at very low lifetime cumulative exposures to amphibole asbestos.

The Risk Assessment Guidance document requires EPA determine the complete exposure pathways that exist for the Libby site. EPA is required to quantify the magnitude, frequency and duration of exposure for each pathway identified in Libby to determine cumulative risk. EPA is required to estimate reasonable maximum exposures for individual pathways. Given the complex multiple pathways of exposure to LA in the Libby area, the combination of exposures across pathways must be considered in cumulative risk estimates.

Exposure assessments must consider past, present, and future exposures. The Libby population has already had significant exposures to date that must be included in any benchmarks with consideration of future acceptable exposures. This is critically important for subpopulations that may be at increased risk from exposures to LA due to increased sensitivity, behavior patterns that may result in high exposure, and/or current or past exposures from other sources. Subpopulations in Libby that may be more sensitive to exposure to LA include infants and children, elderly people, and people with chronic illnesses.

Review of the Proposed Plan to address environmental cleanup at Operable Units 1 and 2  
(OU1 and OU2).

Submitted to the Libby Area Technical Advisory Group (LATAG)

by Terry Spear, Technical Advisor to the TAG

Documents reviewed: Final Remedial Investigation Report, Operable Unit 1 – Former Export Plant Site, August 3, 2009; Final Feasibility Study Report, Operable Unit 1 – Former Export Plant Site, August 2009; Libby Asbestos Superfund Site OU1 – Former Export Plant, Proposed Plan for Public Comment, September 2009; Final Feasibility Study Report, Operable Unit – Former Screening Plant and Surrounding Properties, August 2009; Libby Asbestos Superfund Site OU2 – Former Screening Plant, Proposed Plan for Public Comment, September 2009.

November 9, 2009

The risks to residents of Libby and visitors to the area due to exposure to Libby amphibole (LA) asbestos poses a unique threat due to the multiple pathways of exposure. Residents and workers in Libby may be exposed through inhalation of LA in outdoor ambient air, inhalation while engaged in outdoor activities that disturb a LA in soil (e.g., mowing, raking, digging), and inhalation of LA indoors at home or at work. Because of the multiple pathways of exposure, the risks of cancer and non-cancer adverse health effects must be reduced as low as possible in all Operable Units. It is my opinion that the proposed Records of Decision (RODs) for Operable Units 1 and 2 are premature and do not guarantee protection of public health because of the following:

- 1. Uncertainties in risk assessment:** Uncertainty in risk assessment is increased when using dose-response information only from animal studies, using dose-response information from high doses (occupational) to predict adverse health effects from low exposure, and not considering increased susceptibility of special groups within the exposed population. Susceptible groups in Libby include children whose lungs are not fully developed until early adulthood, or immune-compromised individuals. Risk models may underestimate exposures to children because: (a) their lungs are still developing, (b) children are known to have faster breathing rates; (c) children's breathing zone is closer to the ground and thus more likely to breathe soil/dust contaminated with LA; (d) activity patterns for children may increase their airborne exposures. Children's increased levels of physical activity result in proportionally greater minute volumes, likely leading to increased dose; (e) added risk for childhood exposure relates to their longer span

of life years which allows for a significant cumulative dose from low level LA exposure followed by latencies adequate to cause significant health effects.

Current risk models may underestimate the risk associated with exposure to LA. Risk models based on working populations do not address susceptible populations or brief exposures to high levels of asbestos. The current risk models do not adequately address risks associated with low-dose exposure to the mixed- LA seen in Libby. The shape of the exposure-response curve at low cumulative exposures is not known. Current risk models assume a linear relationship and the slope is largely derived from occupational cohorts with much higher exposure levels. Exposure estimates provided in the epidemiological reports used to derive the current risk models are often highly uncertain. The cancer unit risks derived by USEPA (1986) and USEPA (2008) are based on mortality statistics from the 1970's, and consequently may not be applicable to populations that are exposed to asbestos today. The risk of developing cancer from an exposure to asbestos has increased as life expectancy has increased. Thus, cancer risk predications based on the current method may be underestimating risk by up to 20%. Finally, the current risk models do not address the risks posed by fibers less than 5 micrometers (um) in length or less than 0.25 um in diameter. Air sampling data from Libby reported by several researchers indicate that the majority of airborne fibers are less than 5 um in length when analyzed by transmission electron microscopy.

2. **Lack of a reference concentration (RfC) for inhalation exposure to LA, including non-cancer risks of LA fibers less than 5 micrometers (um) in length and 0.25 um in diameter:** The occurrence of non-cancer effects are a significant human health concern in the Libby community and affect a large segment of the population (18%). These non-cancer adverse health outcomes maybe be more significant than cancerous effects and are not addressed by the current cancer risk models. Studies of former workers and residents provide strong evidence that exposure to LA results in an increased incidence of non-cancer adverse effects, and that these effects occur in some individuals who appear to have had only low exposure.

Animal and *in vitro* studies suggest that fibers less than 5 um in length may play a role in fibrosis. EPA risk assessments based on regulated (or PCME) fibers with lengths greater than 5 um and widths greater than 0.25 um could grossly underestimate exposure to short and thin fibers and lead to uncertainties in risk estimates. Approximately 50% of the fibers seen in Libby are less than 5 um in length and 30% are less than 0.25 um in diameter. To reduce uncertainties and address the most significant health concerns in Libby, the reference concentration (RfC) for inhalation exposure to LA should be based on TEM analysis, including characterization of short (< 5 um) and thin (<0.25 um) fibers, and the role these fibers play in causing non-cancer adverse health effects.

3. **Lack of epidemiology data in Libby:** The toxicity values (carcinogenic and non-carcinogenic) for the mix of amphiboles in LA are being derived from dose-response relationships for the first time. Dose-response information can be derived from a number of different studies which include human health effects when available as well as animal studies. It has been well established that when human health data is available, it provides the information that creates less uncertainty than when other methods are used. The National Toxicology Program (NTP) states that toxicology studies along with epidemiology studies are the best means available for identifying potential human hazards. To further reduce uncertainty in any Records of Decision in Libby, the risk of inhalation exposure to LA must be evaluated using epidemiological studies of the Libby community. Epidemiological studies, together with toxicological studies, are needed to assess the health effects of low-dose exposures to LA. These studies should include examination of family members of former mine workers, people with short-term high-dose exposures, people with long-term low-dose exposures, and children. In addition to epidemiological studies in Libby, EPA should consider recent case-control studies which provide evidence for increased mesothelioma and lung cancer risks at very low lifetime cumulative exposures to amphibole asbestos.
4. **Gaps in solid matrix sampling data quantification:** The current analytical methods for solid matrix sampling (i.e., soil sampling) is insufficient for cleanup decisions. The use of polarized light microscopy (PLM) for (a) identifying concentrations of Libby amphibole in environmental media (i.e., soils), and (b) basing cleanup strategies on these results is not protective of public health. It is important to note that the 1% rule is not derived from a risk assessment or any other type of health-based analysis; therefore, it does not ensure that airborne asbestos fibers re-suspended by disturbing these soils will be below levels protective of human health. It is well established that disturbing soil containing less than 1% LA can re-suspend fibers and generate airborne concentrations that may pose a risk to public health. Analytical methods are needed that will reliably measure Libby amphibole in soils at concentrations well below 1%. In recent unpublished research outside of OU3, bulk samples of ash were reported as Trace <0.5 - 1% when analyzed by TEM method EPA/600/R-93/116. When analyzed by ASTM Method D 5755-03, these same samples showed between 4 to 12 million structures per gram for fibers < 5 microns and between 4 to 6 million structures per gram for fibers  $\geq$  5 microns. The limitations of expressing asbestos concentrations in % are obvious from the above example when concentrations reported as trace contain millions of fibers per gram.

The estimation of bulk asbestos content in soil at OU1 and OU2 is uncertain because the soil sampling protocol may not accurately quantify the concentration of LA. Based on the preponderance of short fibers in Libby, use of the PLM method for final clearance is not appropriate. Soil samples that are below the limit of detection by polarized light microscopy (PLM) techniques may show high levels of asbestos fibers by other types of microscopic techniques (e.g., scanning electron microscope (SEM) or transmission electron microscopy (TEM)). In



addition, for soils samples below the limit of detection by TEM analysis there is at least a 5% chance that the true value could be higher. Given the limitations of the analytical methods for identifying and quantifying LA in soils at OU1 and OU2, it is impossible to say that the pathways of exposure have been eliminated.

5. **Gaps in air sampling data quantification:** The development of improved air sampling and analytical methods for LA includes (a) reducing inter-operator and inter-laboratory variability of the current fiber analytical methods, (b) developing fiber analytical methods with improved resolution to visualize smaller diameter fibers to assure more complete fiber counts, (c) developing a practical analytical method to differentiate between airborne exposures to asbestiform fibers from the asbestos minerals and fiber-like cleavage fragments from their non-asbestiform analogs, (d) developing analytical methods to assess fiber durability, (e) evaluating the collection efficiency of LA, and (f) comparison of direct and indirect sample preparation methods.

Because of the variability of LA in air, estimates of mean exposure concentrations are uncertain due to random variation between samples. Consequently, a large number of samples are required to ensure that the data are representative. In addition, risk calculations based on mean air concentrations, rather than the 95th upper confidence level (UCL), represent a source of uncertainty. The lack of a method for calculating the 95th UCL could result in an underestimation of risk. Additionally, air sampling data reported from a laboratory as non-detect are treated as zero. It is probable that some of these zero values contain LA that is not quantified. Finally, air sampling data for LA represents only a point in time that may not be representative of exposure under various activities and environmental conditions.

These limitations, together with the limited activity-based sampling at OU1 and OU2, make the proposed Records of Decision highly uncertain. Detailed site-specific monitoring with analyses by TEM for more a comprehensive consideration of site-specific conditions related to OU1 and OU2 is needed. Risk assessments based on estimated mean anticipated exposures in OU1 and 2 are not appropriate, and risk calculations should be based on concentrations expected for the greatest exposure scenarios anticipated in OU1 and 2.

6. **Gaps in exposure pathway quantification:** The relationship between LA contamination of soil and indoor dust to airborne concentrations of LA is poorly understood. Further research is needed to better define this relationship. Activity-based sampling, together with reliable sampling and analytical methods for LA in solid matrices (soils and dust) and air, should provide for a better understanding of the relationship between LA contamination of soil and indoor dust to airborne concentrations of LA. Exposure parameters of Central Tendency Exposure (CTE) and Reasonable Maximum Exposure (RME) can be uncertain and this uncertainty would be reduced by activity-based sampling.

EPA has conducted activity-based sampling at residential and commercial properties in Libby in 2007 and 2008. Preliminary review of these results indicates that the current removal action level for LA in soil is likely to be revised to a lower concentration. Limited activity-based sampling has been done at OU1 and OU2. At OU1, only 8 activity-based sampling values are available, and these values may not be representative of the true long term average exposure concentration for soil disturbances at OU1. The mean is highly uncertain and may be low. The data may underestimate exposure and risk because most of the ground was wetted to suppress dust dispersion before mowing.

Extensive activity-based sampling, using TEM analysis to characterize the entire spectrum of exposures generated (size and type of amphibole), should be performed throughout the Libby Asbestos Site and within all Operable Units to determine potential cumulative exposure of residents to Libby amphibole. Activity-based sampling must be specific to each Operable Unit and used to simulate likely site activities and potential exposures associated with these activities. In addition to the collection of personal samples at appropriate breathing zone height, the activity based sampling should include surface wipe samples of protective clothing worn and equipment used by the researchers. Research in the Libby area has demonstrated a strong potential for clothing and equipment contamination among people working with and around material contaminated with LA. This contamination may serve as a secondary source of exposure to those that work or recreate around contaminated material. In addition, family members, etc., not directly exposed to LA may be exposed while laundering contaminated clothing. Perimeter samples must be collected to document migration concurrent with the activity-based sampling. Background (control) samples must be collected concurrent with and upwind in general area as the activity-based sampling at a distance sufficient to prevent being influenced by the simulated activities. Soil moisture and wind data must be collected in conjunction with the activity based sampling. The analytical data obtained must contain the full details on the particle size (length, width, mineral type) of all asbestos structures observed, so that these data can be used in prospective studies (including studies of low dose and childhood exposure) and cancer and non-cancer risk models.

- 7. Gaps in cleanup efficacy data and elimination of exposure pathways:**  
Because trace levels or higher levels of LA are present in soil at OU1 and OU2 and in other areas throughout Libby, future exposure associated with disturbing on-site soil during construction or redevelopment events at these sites is a potential exposure pathway. In addition, trace levels or higher levels of LA are vulnerable to disturbance by various anthropogenic or natural activities. Consequently, residents can be potentially exposed to asbestos fibers released from asbestos-containing debris or soil due to disturbance by common human intrusive activities or natural processes (e.g., wind erosion, precipitation, and extreme changes in temperature) either now or in the future. Uncontrolled

drainage of water from areas contaminated with LA may result in environmental dispersion of asbestos.

Indoor stationary air monitoring performed at varying time periods following completion of cleanup actions at specific properties in Libby showed low airborne concentrations of LA following cleanup, and the level remained low for about a year. However, at some of the homes, there appeared to be an upward trend in airborne levels of LA, suggesting the potential for re-contamination. This indicates pathways of exposure still exist after the completion of cleanup activities. EPA should base clean-up targets on activities that have been shown to produce elevated concentrations by TEM analysis. Detailed site-specific monitoring using TEM methods is needed for more a comprehensive consideration of site-specific conditions related to OU1 and OU2 to assure that exposure pathways have been eliminated.

### Summary

From the above discussion, it is clear that we still do not have enough information to estimate cancer and non-cancer risks from community exposures to LA associated with OU1 and OU2. Because of the complex multiple pathways of exposure to LA in the Libby area, and the lack of representative activity based sampling exposure data from the OU1 and OU2, uncertainties in exposure and risk of adverse health effects associated with OU1 and OU2 could result in an underestimate of cumulative cancer and non-cancer risks from exposure to LA in Libby.

The potential future health risks to Libby residents from exposure to LA is unknown because of uncertainties associated with: (a) the methods used to analyze asbestos; (b) the estimation of potential exposure to airborne asbestos from contaminated soils; (c) the lack toxicological information specific to LA; (d) the relative toxicity of short asbestos fibers (i.e., fibers  $<5\ \mu\text{m}$  in length) in non-cancer health effects and (e) the lack of epidemiologic data evaluating the risk of adverse health outcomes associated with low-level, intermittent exposures to LA.

Before any Records of Decision are implemented in Libby, the uncertainties outlined above must be addressed:

- (a) Improved analytical methods must be used to quantify levels of LA in both soil and air at OU1 and OU2 and throughout Libby.
- (b) Conduct site-specific, activity-based field tests, during all seasons of the year, to assist in developing empirical relationships for exposure scenarios involving re-suspension of asbestos fibers from solid media (e.g., soil, dust) into air. Without knowledge of such relationships, the assurance of the elimination of exposure pathways and the protection of public health is uncertain. These limitations impede site-specific exposure assessment and risk characterization.
- (c) Execute a comprehensive LA toxicity assessment to determine the effectiveness of the Libby clean-up actions and whether more actions are required. The toxicity assessment should include the effects of low dose exposure on susceptible populations, including children.

Toxicology studies are also needed to adequately define the toxicity associated with short (<5  $\mu\text{m}$ ) LA fibers since these fibers are predominant in Libby, including ambient air.

- (d) Determine the reference concentration (RfC) for inhalation exposure to LA, including the risk contribution of LA fibers less than 5 micrometers ( $\mu\text{m}$ ) in length and 0.25  $\mu\text{m}$  in diameter.
- (e) Sponsor epidemiologic studies employing the use of activity-based sampling results from Libby to allow the reconstruction of lower-bound estimates of exposure to LA associated with clinically detectable disease.

In policies issued by EPA in their Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund, EPA is required to understand the cumulative risk from all exposures in the Libby area, and not just one OU. Recent case-control studies provide evidence for increased mesothelioma and lung cancer risks at very low lifetime cumulative exposures to amphibole asbestos.

The Risk Assessment Guidance document requires EPA determine the complete exposure pathways that exist for the Libby site. EPA is required to quantify the magnitude, frequency and duration of exposure for each pathway identified in Libby to determine cumulative risk. EPA is required to estimate reasonable maximum exposures for individual pathways. Given the complex multiple pathways of exposure to LA in the Libby area, the combination of exposures across pathways must be considered in cumulative risk estimates.

Exposure assessments must consider past, present, and future exposures. The Libby population has already had significant exposures to date that must be included in any benchmarks with consideration of future acceptable exposures. This is critically important for subpopulations that may be at increased risk from exposures to LA due to increased sensitivity, behavior patterns that may result in high exposure, and/or current or past exposures from other sources. Subpopulations in Libby that may be more sensitive to exposure to LA include infants and children, elderly people, and people with chronic illnesses.

LATAG's commentary on EPA's proposed plans for remediation of Operable Units 1 & 2.

Submitted on January 4, 2010

#### Introduction:

The Libby Area Technical Advisory Group requested Terry Spear, PhD, the group's technical advisor, to provide commentary on EPA's proposed plans for remediation of Operable Units 1 and 2. The LATAG Board has been working with Dr. Spear under contract this past year, bringing his expertise to assist the group in review of clean-up activities and make recommendations. Dr. Spear is a professor of industrial hygiene at the U of Montana/ Montana Tech., Butte, MT.

The LATAG Board has participated in the development of this document, and has reviewed and approved this final document generated by Dr. Spear for submission to the EPA in response to the request for commentary on proposed remedial plans for OU 1 and 2.

Review of the Proposed Plan to address environmental cleanup at Operable Units 1 and 2 (OU1 and OU2).

Submitted to the Libby Area Technical Advisory Group (LATAG)

by Terry Spear, Technical Advisor to the TAG

Documents reviewed: Final Remedial Investigation Report, Operable Unit 1 – Former Export Plant Site, August 3, 2009; Final Feasibility Study Report, Operable Unit 1 – Former Export Plant Site, August 2009; Libby Asbestos Superfund Site OU1 – Former Export Plant, Proposed Plan for Public Comment, September 2009; Final Feasibility Study Report, Operable Unit – Former Screening Plant and Surrounding Properties, August 2009; Libby Asbestos Superfund Site OU2 – Former Screening Plant, Proposed Plan for Public Comment, September 2009.

November 9, 2009

The risks to residents of Libby and visitors to the area due to exposure to Libby amphibole (LA) asbestos poses a unique threat due to the multiple pathways of exposure. Residents and workers in Libby may be exposed through inhalation of LA in outdoor ambient air, inhalation while engaged in outdoor activities that disturb a LA in soil (e.g., mowing, raking, digging), and inhalation of LA indoors at home or at work. Because of the multiple pathways of exposure, the risks of cancer and non-cancer adverse health effects must be reduced as low as possible in all Operable Units. It is my opinion that the proposed Records of Decision (RODs) for Operable Units 1 and 2 are premature and do not guarantee protection of public health because of the following:

- 1. Uncertainties in risk assessment:** Uncertainty in risk assessment is increased when using dose-response information only from animal studies, using dose-response information from high doses (occupational) to predict adverse health effects from low exposure, and not considering increased susceptibility of special groups within the exposed population. Susceptible groups in Libby include children whose lungs are not fully developed until early adulthood, or immune-compromised individuals. Risk models may underestimate exposures to children because: (a) their lungs are still developing, (b) children are known to have faster breathing rates; (c) children's breathing zone is closer to the ground and thus more likely to breathe soil/dust contaminated with LA; (d) activity patterns for children may increase their airborne exposures. Children's increased levels of physical activity result in proportionally greater minute volumes, likely leading to increased dose; (e) added risk for childhood exposure relates to their longer span of life years which allows for a significant cumulative dose from low level LA exposure followed by latencies adequate to cause significant health effects.

Current risk models may underestimate the risk associated with exposure to LA. Risk models based on working populations do not address susceptible populations or brief exposures to high levels of asbestos. The current risk models do not adequately address risks associated with low-dose exposure to the mixed- LA seen in Libby. The shape of the exposure-response curve at low cumulative exposures is not known. Current risk models assume a linear relationship and the slope is largely derived from occupational cohorts with much higher exposure levels. Exposure estimates provided in the epidemiological reports used to derive the current risk models are often highly uncertain. The cancer unit risks derived by USEPA (1986) and USEPA (2008) are based on mortality statistics from the 1970's, and consequently may not be applicable to populations that are exposed to asbestos today. The risk of developing cancer from an exposure to asbestos has increased as life expectancy has increased. Thus, cancer risk predications based on the current method may be underestimating risk by up to 20%. Finally, the current risk models do not address the risks posed by fibers less than 5 micrometers ( $\mu\text{m}$ ) in length or less than 0.25  $\mu\text{m}$  in diameter. Air sampling data from Libby reported by several researchers indicate that the majority of airborne fibers are less than 5  $\mu\text{m}$  in length when analyzed by transmission electron microscopy.

2. **Lack of a reference concentration (RfC) for inhalation exposure to LA, including non-cancer risks of LA fibers less than 5 micrometers (um) in length and 0.25 um in diameter:** The occurrence of non-cancer effects are a significant human health concern in the Libby community and affect a large segment of the population (18%). These non-cancer adverse health outcomes maybe be more significant than cancerous effects and are not addressed by the current cancer risk models. Studies of former workers and residents provide strong evidence that exposure to LA results in an increased incidence of non-cancer adverse effects, and that these effects occur in some individuals who appear to have had only low exposure.

Animal and *in vitro* studies suggest that fibers less than 5 um in length may play a role in fibrosis. EPA risk assessments based on regulated (or PCME) fibers with lengths greater than 5 um and widths greater than 0.25 um could grossly underestimate exposure to short and thin fibers and lead to uncertainties in risk estimates. Approximately 50% of the fibers seen in Libby are less than 5 um in length and 30% are less than 0.25 um in diameter. To reduce uncertainties and address the most significant health concerns in Libby, the reference concentration (RfC) for inhalation exposure to LA should be based on TEM analysis, including characterization of short (< 5 um) and thin (<0.25 um) fibers, and the role these fibers play in causing non-cancer adverse health effects.

3. **Lack of epidemiology data in Libby:** The toxicity values (carcinogenic and non-carcinogenic) for the mix of amphiboles in LA are being derived from dose-response relationships for the first time. Dose-response information can be derived from a number of different studies which include human health effects when available as well as animal studies. It has been well established that when human health data is available, it provides the information that creates less uncertainty than when other methods are used. The National Toxicology Program (NTP) states that toxicology studies along with epidemiology studies are the best means available for identifying potential human hazards. To further reduce uncertainty in any Records of Decision in Libby, the risk of inhalation exposure to LA must be evaluated using epidemiological studies of the Libby community. Epidemiological studies, together with toxicological studies, are needed to assess the health effects of low-dose exposures to LA. These studies should include examination of family members of former mine workers, people with short-term high-dose exposures, people with long-term low-dose exposures, and children. In addition to epidemiological studies in Libby, EPA should consider recent case-control studies which provide evidence for increased mesothelioma and lung cancer risks at very low lifetime cumulative exposures to amphibole asbestos.
4. **Gaps in solid matrix sampling data quantification:** The current analytical methods for solid matrix sampling (i.e., soil sampling) is insufficient for cleanup decisions. The use of polarized light microscopy (PLM) for (a) identifying concentrations of Libby amphibole in environmental media (i.e., soils), and (b) basing cleanup strategies on these results is not protective of public health. It is

important to note that the 1% rule is not derived from a risk assessment or any other type of health-based analysis; therefore, it does not ensure that airborne asbestos fibers re-suspended by disturbing these soils will be below levels protective of human health. It is well established that disturbing soil containing less than 1% LA can re-suspend fibers and generate airborne concentrations that may pose a risk to public health. Analytical methods are needed that will reliably measure Libby amphibole in soils at concentrations well below 1%. In recent unpublished research outside of OU3, bulk samples of ash were reported as Trace <0.5 - 1% when analyzed by TEM method EPA/600/R-93/116. When analyzed by ASTM Method D 5755-03, these same samples showed between 4 to 12 million structures per gram for fibers < 5 microns and between 4 to 6 million structures per gram for fibers  $\geq$  5 microns. The limitations of expressing asbestos concentrations in % are obvious from the above example when concentrations reported as trace contain millions of fibers per gram.

The estimation of bulk asbestos content in soil at OU1 and OU2 is uncertain because the soil sampling protocol may not accurately quantify the concentration of LA. Based on the preponderance of short fibers in Libby, use of the PLM method for final clearance is not appropriate. Soil samples that are below the limit of detection by polarized light microscopy (PLM) techniques may show high levels of asbestos fibers by other types of microscopic techniques (e.g., scanning electron microscope (SEM) or transmission electron microscopy (TEM)). In addition, for soils samples below the limit of detection by TEM analysis there is at least a 5% chance that the true value could be higher. Given the limitations of the analytical methods for identifying and quantifying LA in soils at OU1 and OU2, it is impossible to say that the pathways of exposure have been eliminated.

5. **Gaps in air sampling data quantification:** The development of improved air sampling and analytical methods for LA includes (a) reducing inter-operator and inter-laboratory variability of the current fiber analytical methods, (b) developing fiber analytical methods with improved resolution to visualize smaller diameter fibers to assure more complete fiber counts, (c) developing a practical analytical method to differentiate between airborne exposures to asbestiform fibers from the asbestos minerals and fiber-like cleavage fragments from their non-asbestiform analogs, (d) developing analytical methods to assess fiber durability, (e) evaluating the collection efficiency of LA, and (f) comparison of direct and indirect sample preparation methods.

Because of the variability of LA in air, estimates of mean exposure concentrations are uncertain due to random variation between samples. Consequently, a large number of samples are required to ensure that the data are representative. In addition, risk calculations based on mean air concentrations, rather than the 95th upper confidence level (UCL), represent a source of uncertainty. The lack of a method for calculating the 95th UCL could result in an underestimation of risk. Additionally, air sampling data reported from a laboratory as non-detect are treated as zero. It is probable that some of these zero values contain LA that is not



quantified. Finally, air sampling data for LA represents only a point in time that may not be representative of exposure under various activities and environmental conditions.

These limitations, together with the limited activity-based sampling at OU1 and OU2, make the proposed Records of Decision highly uncertain. Detailed site-specific monitoring with analyses by TEM for more a comprehensive consideration of site-specific conditions related to OU1 and OU2 is needed. Risk assessments based on estimated mean anticipated exposures in OU1 and 2 are not appropriate, and risk calculations should be based on concentrations expected for the greatest exposure scenarios anticipated in OU1 and 2.

6. **Gaps in exposure pathway quantification:** The relationship between LA contamination of soil and indoor dust to airborne concentrations of LA is poorly understood. Further research is needed to better define this relationship. Activity-based sampling, together with reliable sampling and analytical methods for LA in solid matrices (soils and dust) and air, should provide for a better understanding of the relationship between LA contamination of soil and indoor dust to airborne concentrations of LA. Exposure parameters of Central Tendency Exposure (CTE) and Reasonable Maximum Exposure (RME) can be uncertain and this uncertainty would be reduced by activity-based sampling.

EPA has conducted activity-based sampling at residential and commercial properties in Libby in 2007 and 2008. Preliminary review of these results indicates that the current removal action level for LA in soil is likely to be revised to a lower concentration. Limited activity-based sampling has been done at OU1 and OU2. At OU1, only 8 activity-based sampling values are available, and these values may not be representative of the true long term average exposure concentration for soil disturbances at OU1. The mean is highly uncertain and may be low. The data may underestimate exposure and risk because most of the ground was wetted to suppress dust dispersion before mowing.

Extensive activity-based sampling, using TEM analysis to characterize the entire spectrum of exposures generated (size and type of amphibole), should be performed throughout the Libby Asbestos Site and within all Operable Units to determine potential cumulative exposure of residents to Libby amphibole. Activity-based sampling must be specific to each Operable Unit and used to simulate likely site activities and potential exposures associated with these activities. In addition to the collection of personal samples at appropriate breathing zone height, the activity based sampling should include surface wipe samples of protective clothing worn and equipment used by the researchers. Research in the Libby area has demonstrated a strong potential for clothing and equipment contamination among people working with and around material contaminated with LA. This contamination may serve as a secondary source of exposure to those that work or recreate around contaminated material. In addition, family members, etc., not directly exposed to LA may be exposed while laundering contaminated clothing. Perimeter samples must be collected to

document migration concurrent with the activity-based sampling. Background (control) samples must be collected concurrent with and upwind in general area as the activity-based sampling at a distance sufficient to prevent being influenced by the simulated activities. Soil moisture and wind data must be collected in conjunction with the activity based sampling. The analytical data obtained must contain the full details on the particle size (length, width, mineral type) of all asbestos structures observed, so that these data can be used in prospective studies (including studies of low dose and childhood exposure) and cancer and non-cancer risk models.

7. **Gaps in cleanup efficacy data and elimination of exposure pathways:** Because trace levels or higher levels of LA are present in soil at OU1 and OU2 and in other areas throughout Libby, future exposure associated with disturbing on-site soil during construction or redevelopment events at these sites is a potential exposure pathway. In addition, trace levels or higher levels of LA are vulnerable to disturbance by various anthropogenic or natural activities. Consequently, residents can be potentially exposed to asbestos fibers released from asbestos-containing debris or soil due to disturbance by common human intrusive activities or natural processes (e.g., wind erosion, precipitation, and extreme changes in temperature) either now or in the future. Uncontrolled drainage of water from areas contaminated with LA may result in environmental dispersion of asbestos.

Indoor stationary air monitoring performed at varying time periods following completion of cleanup actions at specific properties in Libby showed low airborne concentrations of LA following cleanup, and the level remained low for about a year. However, at some of the homes, there appeared to be an upward trend in airborne levels of LA, suggesting the potential for re-contamination. This indicates pathways of exposure still exist after the completion of cleanup activities. EPA should base clean-up targets on activities that have been shown to produce elevated concentrations by TEM analysis. Detailed site-specific monitoring using TEM methods is needed for more a comprehensive consideration of site-specific conditions related to OU1 and OU2 to assure that exposure pathways have been eliminated.

### Summary

From the above discussion, it is clear that we still do not have enough information to estimate cancer and non-cancer risks from community exposures to LA associated with OU1 and OU2. Because of the complex multiple pathways of exposure to LA in the Libby area, and the lack of representative activity based sampling exposure data from the OU1 and OU2, uncertainties in exposure and risk of adverse health effects associated with OU1 and OU2 could result in an underestimate of cumulative cancer and non-cancer risks from exposure to LA in Libby.

The potential future health risks to Libby residents from exposure to LA is unknown because of uncertainties associated with: (a) the methods used to analyze asbestos; (b) the estimation of potential exposure to airborne asbestos from contaminated

soils; (c) the lack toxicological information specific to LA; (d) the relative toxicity of short asbestos fibers (i.e., fibers  $<5\ \mu\text{m}$  in length) in non-cancer health effects and (e) the lack of epidemiologic data evaluating the risk of adverse health outcomes associated with low-level, intermittent exposures to LA.

Before any Records of Decision are implemented in Libby, the uncertainties outlined above must be addressed:

- (a) Improved analytical methods must be used to quantify levels of LA in both soil and air at OU1 and OU2 and throughout Libby.
- (b) Conduct site-specific, activity-based field tests, during all seasons of the year, to assist in developing empirical relationships for exposure scenarios involving re-suspension of asbestos fibers from solid media (e.g., soil, dust) into air. Without knowledge of such relationships, the assurance of the elimination of exposure pathways and the protection of public health is uncertain. These limitations impede site-specific exposure assessment and risk characterization.
- (c) Execute a comprehensive LA toxicity assessment to determine the effectiveness of the Libby clean-up actions and whether more actions are required. The toxicity assessment should include the effects of low dose exposure on susceptible populations, including children. Toxicology studies are also needed to adequately define the toxicity associated with short ( $<5\ \mu\text{m}$ ) LA fibers since these fibers are predominant in Libby, including ambient air.
- (d) Determine the reference concentration (RfC) for inhalation exposure to LA, including the risk contribution of LA fibers less than 5 micrometers ( $\mu\text{m}$ ) in length and 0.25  $\mu\text{m}$  in diameter.
- (e) Sponsor epidemiologic studies employing the use of activity-based sampling results from Libby to allow the reconstruction of lower-bound estimates of exposure to LA associated with clinically detectable disease.

In policies issued by EPA in their Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund, EPA is required to understand the cumulative risk from all exposures in the Libby area, and not just one OU. Recent case-control studies provide evidence for increased mesothelioma and lung cancer risks at very low lifetime cumulative exposures to amphibole asbestos.

The Risk Assessment Guidance document requires EPA determine the complete exposure pathways that exist for the Libby site. EPA is required to quantify the magnitude, frequency and duration of exposure for each pathway identified in Libby to determine cumulative risk. EPA is required to estimate reasonable maximum exposures for individual pathways. Given the complex multiple pathways of exposure to LA in the Libby area, the combination of exposures across pathways must be considered in cumulative risk estimates.

Exposure assessments must consider past, present, and future exposures. The Libby population has already had significant exposures to date that must be included in any benchmarks with consideration of future acceptable exposures. This is critically important for subpopulations that may be at increased risk from exposures to LA due to

increased sensitivity, behavior patterns that may result in high exposure, and/or current or past exposures from other sources. Subpopulations in Libby that may be more sensitive to exposure to LA include infants and children, elderly people, and people with chronic illnesses.

*FineArt-World.com*

82 Cedar Street Extension  
Libby, Montana 59923



\$1.220  
US POSTAGE  
FIRST-CLASS  
062S0006962311  
59923



C14879.20

**TED LENNERT  
OFFICE OF COMMUNICATION &  
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT  
U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCY,  
REGION 8-OC  
1595 WYNKOOP STREET  
DENVER, COLORADO 80202-1129**